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0. Introduction. A number of researchers in Salishan languages have discussed relative clause constructions. In the Coast branch of the family Hukari (1977) and Gerds (1982) give detailed descriptions of Halkomelem constructions that translate into English as relative clauses. Hukari (1977) also discusses relative clauses in Lushootseed and compares them to similar structures in Halkomelem. But Hess and Hilbert (1980b) claim that there are no relative clauses in Lushootseed. Jelinek (1987) discusses "headless" relatives in the Lummi dialect of North Straits. In that analysis every word that is preceded by a determiner is a relative clause. In the Interior branch, Thompson and Thompson (to appear) state that "it seems impossible to identify a particular Thompson [River Salish] structure that would meaningfully be described as a relative clause." In the Bella Coola branch of Salishan Davis and Saunders (1987) explicitly argue that relative clauses do not exist in that language. All of these studies look at very similar, probably cognate structures. Some see relative clauses and some do not. My purpose in this paper is to give a descriptive sketch of the various structures the Saanich dialect of North Straits Salish has to express attribution and to look at structures similar to those designated relative clauses in other Salishan languages from a cross-linguistic and pan-Salishan point of view. I show that there are relative clauses in Saanich but that the evidence I give for Saanich is not to be found in some other Salishan languages.

1. Relative clauses cross-linguistically. Part of the problem in finding relative clauses in Salishan languages is finding a language-independent definition of the construction. For the purposes of this paper I take Keenan and Comrie's (1977) and Keenan's (1985) cross-linguistic characterization of relative clauses as definitive. Thus this paper will not absolutely determine whether or not Saanich has relative clauses but determine only whether or not Saanich has a structure that fits Keenan and Comrie's characterization.

A (restrictive) relative clause minimally has a head and a restricting clause. The restricting clause is a subject-predicate structure having a form more or less like that of a main clause and restricts the reference of the domain specified by the head. So for example, in the man that I saw the head man is an intransitive sentence-like I saw.

Cross-linguistically a determiner and a relative connector are two elements other than a head and restricting clause that may be present. In the example given the is a determiner and that is the connector. Many languages do not have the determiner and the connector may take the form of an invariant particle (that in the example), a relative pronoun (who in place of that in the example), or it may be entirely absent (the man I saw).

Languages differ with respect to the order of the determiner, head, and restricting clause. There are a very few languages where the head is internal to the restricting clause. Keenan (1985) does not distinguish between "internal headed" and "headless" relative clauses.

Languages with external heads must have some way of indicating the grammatical function of the head within the restricting clause. Languages may have case-marked relative pronouns to do this though they are not common outside of European languages, and some languages have "resumptive pronouns", anaphors of the head, internal to the restricting clause. A cross-linguistically common way of indicating the function of the head in the restricting clause is by means of what has been called "gapping", "extraction", or "incomplete valence". In the man that I saw, for example, we know that the head is the direct object of the restricting clause because the valence of the transitive verb saw is incomplete; there is a gap in the direct object position of the restricting clause.

Apparently all languages have some way of producing clausal attribution. But not all languages can be said to have relative clauses. A key diagnostic feature of a true relative clause is that it be a unique construction. That is, if we are to say that a language has a relative clause construction, that construction must be used exclusively for that function. Keenan (1985:166) notes that a number of Australian languages do not have true relative clauses but have the functional equivalent in a general subordinate clause construction. It is this feature of relative clauses, their status as a unique structure in the language, that will be of particular interest in this paper. It is this feature that Hess and Hilbert (1980), Davis and Saunders (1987), and Thompson and Thompson (to appear) find lacking in the attributive constructions they have found in their languages.

2. Attribution in Saanich. There are at least four ways attribution can be expressed in Saanich: in simple predicates, complex predicates, genitive constructions, and clausal attributives. It is the latter that stands as the major candidate for the designation "relative clause", but before I describe these it will be useful to demonstrate basic Saanich clause structure by describing the other three constructions first.

2.1. Simple predicates. To assert a simple attribute the simple predicate construction is used:

(1) ʔaq tsa swayʔaʔ.
    big ꞌom male
    'The man is big.'

Saanich is always predicate initial, so this is a simple intransitive sentence identical in structure to 2.

(2) yeʔ tsa swayʔaʔ.
    go ꞌom ꞌom male
    'The man went.'

Any word (excluding some determiners, prepositions, and a few other particles) may be predicative and apparently any word may be preceded by a determiner to function as a coreferential adjunct to a predicate. Thus swayʔaʔ in 3 is the verb.

(3) swayʔaʔ tsa ʔaq.
    male ꞌom ꞌom big
    'The big one is a man.'

Jelinek (1987) notes that there are some languages (Seneca) that have no subordination at all and therefore cannot be said to have any kind of clausal attribution.

Though Hale 1976 refers to these as "adjoined relative clauses."
Adjuncts coreferential with the pronominal arguments to a predicate are preceded by a demonstrative determiner here labeled OEM'. Third person has overt marking only in possessives, in the subject of certain subordinate clauses, and in the subject of main clause transitives. So eax, ye?, and swa'yqa? in 1, 2, and 3, respectively, are zero marked for third person subject.

First and second person subjects are indicated by second position clitics:

(4) eax__san
big__tsuna
'I'm big.'

(5) eax__rx
big__tsuna
'You're big.'

(6) swa'yqa?__san
male__tsuna
'I'm a man.'

2.2. Complex predicates. A second way attribution is expressed in Saanich is in complex predicate constructions. Complex predicates are composed of two or more words juxtaposed to form a construction that functions as a simple predicate:

(7) eax swa'yqa?.
big male
'He's a big man.'

The first and second person subjects always follow the first of these; they are invariably second position clitics:

(8) eax__san swa'yqa?.
big__tsuna male
'I'm a big man.'

(9) eax__rx swa'yqa?.
big__tsuna male
'You're a big man.'

Otherwise a complex predicate functions as a unit. An adjunct coreferential with the zero marked third person subject can be placed after the complex predicate just as in the simple predicate constructions 1-3:

(10) eax swa'yqa? tsa sítém.
big male nsm boss
'The boss is a big man.'

And if preceded by a determiner, it can function as an adjunct coreferential with a third person argument:

(11) sítém' tsa eax swa'yqa?.
boss nsm big male
'The big man is boss.'

This construction is identical to what Thompson 1979 has called the auxiliary constructions which occur in several Salishan languages. 12-14 are examples of non-attributive complex predicates in Saanich.

(12) tanfé hiw'al.
come join in
'He came to join in. He came and joined in.'

(13) tanfé__san hiw'al.
come__tsuna join in
'I came to join in. I came and joined in.'

(14) ye?__san k'swa'yak).
go__tsuna fishing
'I went/am going fishing.'

There is a small subclass of predicates denoting qualities that may not occur as the second of a pair in some complex predicates.

(15) *swa'yqa? eax.

(16) *sítém' tsa swa'yqa? eax.

There is no obvious semantic or pragmatic reason why 15 and 16 would not be acceptable with 15 having a reading like 'male big one' (cf. example 3). The word swa'yqa? may be occur first in this construction:

(17) swa'yqa? sma'yaq.
big deer
'It's a buck.'

(18) ye? tsa swa'yqa? sma'yaq.
go nsm male deer
'The buck went.'

(19) swa'yqa? steni?.
big female
'She's a mannish woman.'

(20) steni? swa'yqa?.
'male
'He's a womanish man.'

There are some words that eax may follow in complex predicates. These include the person predicates 7sa 'I am', nòk'? 'you are', and ní? 'he/she/it is'.

Jelinek 1988 details the syntax and semantics of another subclass of predicates in the Samish dialect of North Straits. Much more needs to be done in discovering and describing various subcategories of predicates in Salishan languages. For example, 7ay' tsa eax 'the big one is good' and ye? tsa 7ay' 'the good one went' are acceptable but not *eax tsa 7ay'.
(21) si?em’ tsa swiy/qa? sten?.  
boss 3EM male  female  
The man who is the boss.

In all of examples of complex predicates thus far (7-21) it is the attributing word that comes first. Some words (such as 2sg) are inherently attributive and must come first, but others, when they are paired with a word that is equally likely to be attributive, have an attributive or non-attributive interpretation depending on whether or not they are in initial or non-initial position. There is yet another class of words, and these are always attributive in complex predicates whether or not they come first:

(22) ha?aq” tsa sq"aq”i? smaya0.  
stink 3EM dead  deer  
The dead deer stinks.

(23) ha?aq” tsa smaya0 sq"aq”i?.  
. The dead deer stinks.

The predicate sq"aq”i? is attributive whether it precedes or follows smaya0. I have not been able to find any difference in meaning between 22 and 23. I have not been able to find any difference in meaning between 22 and 23. It is constructions such as that in 23 that are potentially relative clauses. I will return to these in section 2.4.

2.3. Genitival constructions. There are three types of genitive attributives. One of these types occurs only in adjuncts; a second has the form of a simple predicate with an oblique adjunct; and a third has the form of a complex predicate.

The possessive person markers are affixes on the possessed term which forms the head of the construction. First person singular and second person are prefixes; first plural and third person are suffixes. These are summarized in 24 and illustrated in 25.

(24)  
Sg.  Pl.  
1 na- -41a  
2  ?an-  
3  -s

(25) na-ten 'It's my mother'  
ten-1a 'It's our mother'  
?an-ten 'It's your mother'  
ten-s 'It's his/her/its mother'

2.3.1. In the first, most common type of genitive attributive the possessed term is the head of a special genitive construction within an adjunct:

(26) tafsat tsa men-s  tsa swiy/la.  
dancing 3EM father-3pos 3EM young man  
The young man's father was dancing.

The adjunct tsa men-s tsa swiy/la must form a constituent in itself with men-s as the head and swiy/la as its adjunct since this sentence is intransitive and reversing the order of these two adjuncts is unacceptable.

(27) *tafsat tsa swiy/la tsa men-s.  
The embedded head-adjunct construction looks like a simple predicate construction, but as an independent predicate it would have quite a different meaning (which is slightly bizarre since swiy/la is often translated 'boy' and actually means 'unmarried young man'):

(28) men-s tsa swiy/la.  
father-3pos 3EM young man  
The young man is his father.

Without the possessive suffix, the two adjuncts in 26 could only be interpreted as independent, but two independent adjuncts occur only in transitive sentences. The main verb of 26 is intransitive, therefore 29, which differs from 26 only in lacking the possessive suffix, is unacceptable:

(29) *tafsat tsa men tsa swiy/la.

The adjunct in 26 has a structure that is used only in forming genitive attributives. Therefore the adjunct in 26 represents a unique genitive construction.

This genitive occurs only in intransitive sentences coreferential with the subject (example 26) and in transitive sentences with a first or second person subject where it is coreferential with the object (example 30):

(30) k"an-nax"_ran tsa men-s tsa swiy/la.  
see-TRANS-3SUBJ 3EM 3EM young man  
'I saw the young man's father.'

If the main verb is transitive with a third person subject, the two adjuncts are interpreted as separate with one coreferential with the subject and the other with the object:

(31) k"an-at-as tsa men-s tsa gan?  
see-TRANS-3SUBJ 3EM 3EM offspring  
'The son looked at his father.'

When one of the adjuncts has a possessive affix and the other does not, the possessed form is always interpreted as object regardless of word order. 33 has the same meaning as 31:

(33) k"an-at-as tsa gan? tsa men-s  
see-TRANS-3SUBJ 3EM 3EM offspring 3EM father-3pos  
'The son looked at his father.'

When both are possessive, the sentence is ambiguous:

(34) k"an-at-as tsa gan?-s tsa men-s  
see-TRANS-3SUBJ offspring-3pos 3EM father-3pos  
'His son looked at his father. / His father looked at his son.'
2.3.2. The second type of genitive construction can usually replace the form described in 2.3.1, but it is not a structure used uniquely as a genitive attributive. This construction has the form of a simple predicate with an oblique adjunct. Example 26 has the same meaning as 35:

(35) tafsat tsa men ʔa k' swiwl/as.
  dancing dem father oml. dem young man
  'The young man's father was dancing.'

The simple predicate sentence in 36 has the same semantics as the adjunct in 35:

(36) men ʔa k' swiwl/as.
   father oml. dem young man
   'It's the young man's father (It's the father of the young man).'

This construction may not be coreferential with the object in a transitive sentence with a first or second person subject:

(37) "k'onnax"_san tsa men ʔa k' swiwl/as.

The head of this construction may occur with or without the possessive affix with no apparent change in meaning. Example 38 is equivalent to 35:

(38) tafsat tsa men-s ʔa k' swiwl/as.
  dancing dem father-1pos oml. dem young man
  'The young man's father was dancing.'

2.3.3. I digress a bit in discussing the third way of expressing genitive attribution. I include it for the sake of completeness and because it's interesting in its own right.

In this construction it is the possessor, not the possessed, that is morphologically marked. A special prefix, tx", "belonging to", is affixed to the possessor:

(39) tx"-tipat swefat.
   belonging to-David reefnet
   'It's David's reefnet.'

I have little data on this construction. It has been recorded only in main predicate constructions like this and never as an adjunct. I have found it only recently in natural texts of the oldest speakers; it has never been offered in direct elicitation. If the meaning of 39 were directly elicited, the response would be:

(40) swefat ʔa k' tipat.
    reefnet oml. dem David
    'It's David's reefnet.'

This construction is one of a number of incorporating forms that I have found only in natural texts. One of the functions (perhaps the only function) of incorporation in Saanich is to provide contrasting focus, which can only be found in context. The incorporated form, 39, allows the possessor to be put into initial, focusing position. The peripheral form, 40, is neutral or tending to focus on the possessed. The contrast between 39 and 40 can be brought out in English by putting heavy stress on David's in 39. This focusing function can best be seen in exchanges such as the following, which occurred between two native speakers:

(41) tx"-sen swefat?  'Whose reefnet was it?'
    tx"-helisleleyaʔ tsa leʔa. 'The one there was Harry Såleleyaʔs.'
    belong to-Harry S. dem there

2.4. Clausal attributives. The construction that most looks like and most often translates as a relative clause in Saanich has a determiner followed by the head followed by the attributing clause; there is no relative pronoun or other connecting particle. The construction (shown bracketed in 42 and 43) fits all of Keenan's (1985) functional criteria:

(42) k"an-nax"_san [tsa swayʔaqʔ k'ik'aw].
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male escaping
    'I saw the man who was getting away.'

(43) k"an-nax"_san [tsa swayʔaqʔ q'ap-aŋ ʔa tsa sča].
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male chop-MOD oml. dem firewood
    'I saw the man who was chopping firewood.'

Unlike the Australian languages mentioned by Keenan, this is not a general subordinating construction. These two sentences contrast with 44 and 45:

(44) k"an-nax"_san tsa swayʔaqʔ k'o s-k'ik'aw-s.
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male sun s-entering-3pos
    'I saw the man when he was getting away.'

(45) k"an-nax"_san tsa swayʔaqʔ k'o s-q'ap-aŋ-s ʔa tsa sča.
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male sun s-chop-MOD 3pos oml. dem firewood
    'I saw the man while he was chopping firewood.'

The particle k'o introduces certain subordinate clauses. When the subject of the subordinate k'o clause is indicated with the possessive affixes (some words also require the s- prefix), the interpretation is indicative. When the subject of the k'o clause is indicated with one of the special subordinate clause subject suffixes, the interpretation is hypothetical as in 46:

(46) k"an-nax"_san tsa swayʔaqʔ k'o k'ik'aw-as.
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male sun escaping-3suBJ
    'I'll see the man if he's getting away.'

The problem with attributives like those in 42 and 43 is not that they are like other subordinate clauses but that they are identical to main clauses. There is no structural difference between 42-43 and 47-48:

(47) k"an-nax"_san tsa swayʔaqʔ. k'ik'aw.
    see-TRANS_Isuru dem male escaping
    'I saw the man. He's getting away.'
The attributive predicate in the bracketed construction in main clauses predicates in Saanich the third person object and third person intransitive subject are zero.

The attributive constructions in 42 and 43 are intransitive and have no overt marking. With an imperative interpretation: 'hit it!' would have to have the ergative suffix; the third person object is always zero.

The attributive constructions in 42 and 43 are intransitive and have no overt marking. It is only transitive constructions that show the restricting clauses in Saanich to be truly dependent:

(50) `k'am-3n-2oB\_3sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male hit-trans

51 summarizes the object suffixes for the -at transitivizer and 52 illustrates them.

(51) Sg. Pl.
1 -3 -ax\*
2 -sa
3 ø

(52a) `k'3n-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-2oB\_1sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `I know the man who hit me.'

Note that when the head of the construction is second person subject, the restricting clause has incomplete valence. That is the third person subject marker is absent; there is a gap where we would expect the subject marker to be. In the object of the restricting clause is first person, and in 56 it is second person. The third person subject is gapped, therefore no ambiguity can arise. There is no need here to switch to the passive when the subject is third and the object second person.

The attributive predicate in the bracketed construction in 50 cannot be interpreted as independent because its valence is incomplete. If it were an independent sentence with a third person subject it would have to have the ergative -at suffix.  'k'am\*n can indeed stand on its own as a sentence but only with an imperative interpretation: 'hit it!'

The dependence of the attributive predicate is even more evident when the object of the restricting clause is first or second person. In order to show this it will be necessary to describe briefly Saanich object marking. 51 summarizes the object suffixes for the -at transitivizer and 52 illustrates them.

(52b) k'3n-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-2oB\_1sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `I looked at you.'

(52c) k'3n-at-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-1sUb\_2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `You looked at me.'

(52d) k'3n-at-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-1sUb\_2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `You looked at us.'

A regular phonological process deletes the /l/ of the transitivizer before the /s/ of the first or second person object. Another general process reduces a pair of contiguous schwas to one. This latter process produces a potentially ambiguous surface form with a high functional load when the third person subject suffix is attached to a stem with a first person singular or second person object:

(53a) /k'3n-at-a-s-a// see-trans-1sUb\_2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `He looked at you (you were looked at).' This ambiguity is invariably resolved in favor of the more highly salient first person. That is, k'3n3s has only the reading 'he looked at me.' In order to say 'he looked at you' one must resort to the passive:

(54) k'3n-at-a-s\_s see-trans-1sUb\_2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `He looked at you (you were looked at).'

Returning to the attributive clauses, it was seen in 50 that when the head of the construction is coreferential with the (third person) subject, the restricting clause has incomplete valence. That is the third person subject marker is absent; there is a gap where we would expect the subject marker to be. In the object of the restricting clause is first person, and in 56 it is second person. The third person subject is gapped, therefore no ambiguity can arise. There is no need here to switch to the passive when the subject is third and the object second person.

(55) `k'3n-at-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-2oB\_1sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male hit-trans-2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `I know the man who hit you.'

(56) `k'3n-at-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-2oB\_1sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male hit-trans-2oB\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `I know the man who hit me.'

(57) `k'3n-at-a-s\_s\_san see-trans-2oB\_1sUb\_ASP know-trans-1sUb\_DEM male `I know the man who hit you.'

There are several transitivizing suffixes in Saanich including -at ~ -4 ~ -3 ~ ø 'control transitive' and -nak ~ -nax ~ -n 'non-control transitive'. The form of the 'control transitive' object paradigm given in 50 is slightly different from the others. See Montler 1986 for details.

8In main clauses predicates in Saanich the third person object and third person intransitive subject are zero marked. A single adjunct following an intransitive predicate is coreferential with the subject and following a transitive predicate is coreferential with the object. Saanich thus displays an ergative-absolutive pattern in the third person of main clauses. Elsewhere, in first and second person and in subordinate clauses, the pattern is nominative-accusative.

9There are several transitivizing suffixes in Saanich including -at ~ -4 ~ -3 ~ ø 'control transitive' and -nak ~ -nax ~ -n 'non-control transitive'. The form of the 'control transitive' object paradigm given in 50 is slightly different from the others. See Montler 1986 for details.

10I have recorded such a form once in context with a second person object reading but I have not been able to reelicit it. Note that k'3n\*at\*3s\*as, where there is no possibility of ambiguity, is perfectly acceptable.
The restricting clause forms a constituent with a following oblique (59) or a non-oblique (60) aduct:

(59)  7aw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  kʷə s̱am̥-ə-s
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU OBL DEM rock
'I know the man who hit you.'

The second variation is that a transitive restricting clause without adjuncts may precede the head. Example 69, thus, has the same meaning as 67:

(69)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  kʷə s̱am̥-ə ʔsan.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU CAT OBL DEM rock
'I know the man who hit you.'

But 63, based on 59 with the oblique object of the restricting clause moved out, is unacceptable:

(60)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  kʷə s̱am̥-ə ʔsan.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU CAT OBL DEM rock
'I hit the cat with a rock.'

The third person transitive subject.

(65)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  [kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  ṯam̥-ə-ʔsan.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU
'I know the man who I hit.'

Examples 65 and 66 are parallel to 55 and 56 but in these the head is the direct object of the restricting clause. 67 shows the third person transitive subject.

(66)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  [kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  ṯam̥-ə-at-əʔə,
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU
'I know the man who you hit.'

(70)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  ṯam̥-ə ʔsan.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU
'I know the man who he hit.'

I have not yet determined what other grammatical relations may be relativized. But all examples given here were easily elicited, and I have not been able to elicit, nor have I found in texts, any comparable examples of relativized genitives or obliques. The only functionally equivalent structures I have found use other general subordinating patterns.

Two variations on this construction must be mentioned though they perhaps cloud the picture. First, a determiner may optionally, and apparently freely intervene between the head and the restricting clause. Thus example 68 has the same meaning as 67:

(68)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  kʷə s̱am̥-ə-at-ə,
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem male  hit-trans ʔsəBU
'I know the man who he hit.'

The second variation is that a transitive restricting clause without adjuncts may precede the head. Example 69, thus, has the same meaning as 66, but 70, with an oblique adjunct following the restricting clause is unacceptable. Example 71 is the same as 42 but the order of the intransitive restricting clause and the head is reversed:

(71)  kʷən-naw  ʔsan  kʷə s̱am̥-ə  ṯam̥-ə swaʔqaʔ.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem escaping ʔsəBU
'I know the one who was getting away.'

This variation looks like the complex predicate attributive construction, but in all non-attributive instances of complex predicates it is the second of the pair that takes the transitive and object inflection.

2.5. Headless relatives. Headless relative clauses have been reported for the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem by Hukari (1980) and for the Lummi dialect of North Straits by Jelinek (1987). In Hukari's analysis the headless relative clauses occur as predicative adjectives similar to the adjectives in the Saanich examples 72 and 73:

(72)  kʷən-naw  ʔsan  kʷə s̱am̥-ə  ṯam̥-ə swaʔqaʔ.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem escaping
'I saw the one who was getting away.'

(73)  ʔaw  x̱i-t  ʔsan  kʷsə swaʔqaʔ  ṯam̥-ə-ʔsan.
ASP know-trans ʔsəBU dem hit-trans ʔsəBU
'I know the one who you hit.'
In English relative clauses usually have an overt head, and thus English uses the semantically empty pronoun 'one' in such constructions. Headless translations of 72 and 73 are also possible (though not semantically identical to the headed English translations): I saw who was getting away and I know who hit you. Gerds' (1982:61) dispute of Hukari's claim is primarily terminological. Gerds (and others including Keenan (1985)) identifies 'headless' relative clauses with 'internal head' relative clauses. It is useful to distinguish two types of 'headless' relatives: those with an overt head internal to the restricting clause and those with no overt head at all. Mallinson and Blake (1981) refer to these as 'internal head relatives' and 'free relatives', respectively. The headless relative clauses in Cowichan, Lummi, and Saanich are free relatives. Internal head relatives are apparently not possible (71 would be an example).

Jelinek (1987), noting that all nonparticles are predicative in Lummi, makes the connection between forms such as the Saanich 74 and 75.

(74) sway'qa? 'It's a man.'

(75) k'oon-nax- _sn k'os sway'qa?. 'I know the man.'

There is no reason to analyze sway'qa? in 75 any differently than k'ix'aw in 72. Therefore 75 contains a free relative: I know the one who is a man. The head, according to Jelinek, is incorporated in the determiner. I can confirm this analysis for Saanich with the following example from a monolingual Saanich speaker born in the 1880's and tape recorded by a speaker of Saanich (a native Cowichan speaker) in 1971.

(76) 'taw nii?i'?a? e'o [k'a q'aaq'ot:i-ss k'sa na-men ASR be only one person evid dem including-trans-subj dem 1pos-father
la'i? tso s-q'aaq'i-ya-ss]
FASC CONJ DEM s-include (pl.-)3pos

'My father and his companions included only one woman.'

This is an intransitive sentence with the bracketed free relative functioning as subject. A more literal translation might be 'the woman who my father and his companions included was the only one.' Note that the word stenii 'woman' appears nowhere in the Saanich sentence. This direct object head is more literal translation might be 'the woman who my father and his companions included was the only one.' Note that the word stenii 'woman' appears nowhere in the Saanich sentence. This direct object head is

3. Conclusion: Saanich compared with other Salishan languages. Among Salishan attributive constructions described thus far, Saanich is most similar to the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem as described by Hukari (1977). The Cowichan structure is virtually identical, but for lexical differences, to Saanich. It has a third person transitive subject marker that is gapped in transitive, subject-headed relative clauses, and it has a set of special subordinate subject suffixes which are used in object-headed relative clauses. Hukari does not give examples of other attributing constructions or of other subordinating constructions as evidence of the uniqueness of the Cowichan attributive clauses. Saanich may differ from Cowichan in allowing a determiner to occur between the head and the restricting clause and in allowing a transitive restricting clause to precede the head.

Lushootseed differs from Saanich in two important ways. One way, discussed above, is that Lushootseed lacks a third person transitive subject marker; non-possessive and non-hypothetical third person subjects and objects are all zero. Therefore there can be no evidence from gapping for the dependence of the attributing clause in Lushootseed.

The other difference between Lushootseed and Saanich is that the cognate set of special subordinate subject suffixes (64) are used exclusively in hypotheticals (subjunctives) in Lushootseed (Hess and Hilbert 1980:38). In Saanich these are hypothetical only when preceded by the subordinator k'k'a,k' (see example 46). Lushootseed has no structures like 65-67 that would show the dependence of the attributive clause when the head is the direct object. In functionally equivalent constructions the attributing clause has a full main clause subject (Hukari 1977:52). With no evidence to the contrary we must conclude, as Hess and Hilbert (1980) claim, Lushootseed has no relative clause construction per se.

The situation is similar in Thompson River Salish; it has no unique relative clause construction. Thompson and Thompson (to appear) list several structures that can be functionally equivalent to relative clauses, but these 'subordinating devices are also used for various other purposes.' And Davis and Saunders (1987) also demonstrate, based on the non-uniqueness of attributing constructions, that Bella Coola has no relative clause.

The diversity of the three Salishan languages lacking relative clauses (Lushootseed is Central Coast, Thompson is Northern Interior, and Bella Coola forms a branch on its own) suggests that the relative clauses in Cowichan and Saanich are a recent development. These two languages have been in intimate contact for many generations. In fact today there are more Cowichan speakers on the Saanich reserves than there are Saanich speakers. Intermarriage is common, and all Saanich speakers can at least understand some Cowichan. There is a great deal of phonological and lexical diffusion between the two especially from Cowichan to Saanich. It is reasonable to conclude that diffusion of relative clauses in both Saanich and Cowichan is due to diffusion. It would be interesting to find out whether relative clauses exist in Klallam. Klallam is very closely related to Saanich, forming with it and the other dialects of North Straits the Straits subgroup of Central Coast Salish. Although it is genetically close to Saanich, Klallam has had very little contact with Cowichan; there is no known lexical or phonological diffusion between the two. If Klallam also has relative clauses, we can conclude that the direction of diffusion is from Saanich to Cowichan.
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This is the translation given by a native speaker of Saanich. The context of this sentence makes it clear that what it means is 'the newborner initiation ritual was so rigorous in my father's generation that only one woman was strong enough to be admitted.'

This subordinator is apparently reconstructable to Proto-Salish *wa *subjective as the introducer of a hypothetical clause (Thompson 1979:744).


---

Pronominal Arguments and the Syntax of Lushootseed Transitives

Robert Hagiwara
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Introduction

Languages of the New World present an important testing ground for generative theories of syntax—in particular the theory of government and binding (recently recast in Chomsky (1986) as the "barriers" framework and which I will refer to as the theory of "parameterized universal grammar"), which was created mostly under the influence of the study of western European languages. My work on Lushootseed has been driven not only by my interest in the language and culture native to the Pacific Northwest, but by my belief that the study of American languages has much to contribute to the generative theory of language, just as this theory has much to contribute to our understanding of the languages of the New World.

In this paper, I want to describe the morphology and syntax of the Lushootseed transitive sentence (S), invoking Jelinek’s (1985) Pronominal Argument Parameter to account for the complementarity between the morphological person marking paradigms (subject clitics and object suffixes) and full noun phrases (NP) representing verbal arguments. In addition, I will analyze the -d and -eb suffixes (suffixes with a somewhat controversial analytical history) as pronominal in the sense of the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH), and suggest that many of the properties of the Lushootseed transitive S follow from interactions of the PAH and the case assigning properties I assume for the Lushootseed S.

2. The Lushootseed person marking morphology

Lushootseed is an argument-dropping (pro-drop) language; that is, arguments of a predicate may be named by an independent noun phrase (NP, or nominal) or it may be omitted, the referent being inferred from context.

(1) ?es-?itut ti?it?eq=ebay? ?es-?itut STV-sleep DEM dog STV-sleep "that dog is sleeping" "he/she/it they 1s/are sleeping"

If an argument of a verb is first or second person, it is realized as a second position (2P) clitic (in the case of subject) or a verbal suffix (in the case of object). Consider the following sets of clauses.

(2) ?es 'hit (with fist)'

?u-tes(e)t-c Zed-
PMT-hit(TR)-1o =2eS "you(sg) hit me"

?u-tes(e)t-sid Zed
PMT-hit(TR)-1o =1eS "I hit you(sg)"

?u-tes(e)t-ubu? Klee
PMT-hit(TR)-1pO =2pS "we hit you(pl)"

"we hit you(pl)"